through genuine canonical quotations. This tendency reached its peak with Aggavaṃsa, who is claimed, by the author of the Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā, to have based his grammar on the Pāli.[97]

<div align="center">(to be continued)</div>

Copenhagen   Ole Holten Pind

---

97 Cf. Kacc-vaṇṇ p. 301,28–30: *Rūpasiddhikārako Candabyākaraṇanissito. Nyāsakārako Kalāpabyākaraṇanissito. Saddanītikārako Pālinissito.*

PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES VII[1]

FIVE PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random collection of words which are either omitted from PED,[2] or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there.

1. *gandhana* "harming"
2. *pāreti* "to be successful"
3. *marissa* "going to die"
4. *vivicca-sayana* "a secluded lodging"
5. *sosinna* "very wet"/*sosīna* "very cold"

1. *gandhana* "harming"

In his investigation of the phrase *vāntaṃ āpātuṃ* "to drink one's vomit",[3] Alsdorf mentioned the Pāli word *gandhana* found in the compound *kula-gandhana* at It 64,9:

> *atijātaṃ anujātaṃ puttaṃ icchanti paṇḍitā,*
> *avajātaṃ na icchanti yo hoti kula-gandhano.*

> "Wise men desire a son of higher birth or equal birth; they do not desire a son of lower birth, who harms the family".

---

1 See K.R. Norman, "Pāli Lexicographical Studies VI", in *JPTS*, XIII, pp. 219–27.

2 Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD). In addition: CDIAL = R.L. Turner, *Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*; EWA = M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*; Geiger = W. Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*; MW = Sir Monier Monier-Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS's *Pali-English Dictionary*; Pischel = R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen*; PSM = Sheth, *Pāiasaddamahaṇṇavo*; PTC = *Pāli Tipiṭakaṃ Concordance*; Pkt = Prakrit; Skt = Sanskrit; GDhp = *Gāndhārī Dharmapada*; Be = Burmese (Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana) edition; Ce = Sinhalese edition; Ee = European (PTS) edition; Se = Siamese edition; cty = commentary.

3 L. Alsdorf, "Vāntaṃ āpātuṃ", *Indian Linguistics*, 16, 1955, 21–28.

This is glossed: *yo hoti kulagandhano ti kulacchedako kulavināsako. chedanattho hi idha gandha-saddo, "uppala-gandha-paccatthikā"*[4] *ti ādisu viya. keci pana kuladhaṃsano ti paṭhanti. so ev' attho* (It-a II 57,13–16). For this meaning of *gandhana* the editor of the PTS edition of It-a, M.M. Bose, drew attention to *amhākaṃ gandhana-kileso palibuddhana-kileso n' atthi, kilesa-ganthi-rahitā mayan ti evaṃ vāditāya laddhanāmavasena Nigaṇṭho* (Sv [Ee] 144,24–26), but Be here reads *ganthana-* and this is probably correct, in view of the fact that it is intended to explain *nigaṇṭha*.

Alsdorf points out that the v.l. *kusajantuno* for *kulagandhano* and the variety of explanations: *kulagandhano ti kulacchedako kulavināsako kuladhaṃsano* in the cty showed that the word was unfamiliar and obsolete. He rejected the suggestion in PED that it should be "corrected" to *kulaṅgāraka*, basing his rejection on the occurrence of *antima-gandhina* at Ja IV 34,17* (*mâhaṃ kule antima-gandhino ahuṃ*, explained: *attano kule sabba-pacchimako c' eva kulapalāpo ca mā assaṃ*, 34,24´), and *mâhaṃ kule antimagandhinī ahuṃ*, 35,19* (explained: *attano kule pacchimikā palāpabhūtā mā assaṃ*, 35,27´–28´). CPD explains *gandhina* as a new stem from *gandhinī*, feminine of *gandhi(n)*, and sees *kule antimagandhina* as a blending of *kulagandhana* and *kul' antima*.

Alsdorf rightly saw that the word *gandhana* must mean something like "destroying, spoiling, disgracing", as does PTC,[5] but he thought that there must be some connection with *gandha* "smell", and he suggested that some such meaning for *kula-gandhana* as "one who brings the family into bad odour, who makes the family stink" might not be altogether unacceptable.

I do not know why Alsdorf did not refer to the root *gandh* "to injure, hurt" (Skt Dhātup xxxiii, 11) or the noun *gandhana* "hurting, injury" (Skt lex.). These meanings are attested not only in the Skt grammarians, but also by the Pāli authorities. It is quite clear that this is the meaning we have here. Although it is not wise to accept the existence of all words quoted in the Skt

---

[4] See Vin III 33,19 (*gandhan ti hadayaṃ vuccati, taṃ uppāṭentī ti uppalagandhā, uppalagandhā eva paccatthikā uppalagandhapaccatthikā*, Sp 268,8–10). Cf. Sadd 548,2–3: *gandhasaddo ca uppalagandhatheno ti ettha chedane vattati ti daṭṭhabbo*; 585,12: *ettha pana gandhasaddassa chedanavācakatte* " … " (quoting It 64,9) *ti ayaṃ pāli nidassanaṃ.*

[5] s.v. *gandhana*.

Dhātupāṭha or the lexicons, Mayrhofer quotes the possibility of connecting the root with Latin *offendo*.[6] He does not list the Pāli or Pkt usages. Turner[7] accepts the connection between Skt *gandhayate* and Pāli *gandhana*.

Alsdorf also wished to see a connection between Pkt *gandhana* and *gandha* in the use of the former as an epithet of families of snakes, and suggested that *gandhana* might represent the snake as sniffing when it sucks back its poison.[8] I would suggest that there is a more obvious differentiation between snakes which are *gandhana* "harmful" and those which are *agandhana* "harmless".

PTC also lists *kula-gatthinī* (Ja V 306,14*,21*), but this compound is not included in PED, s.v. *kula*, nor is any word *gatthi(n)* listed. It is glossed: *kulagatthinī ti udāhu tvaṃ kula-dūsikā* (306,16´). Ee gives the v.l. *viddhinī* for all places, but the other editions read *kula-gandhinī*.

2. *pāreti* "to be successful"

PED gives only one reference for this word, Ja III 185,2*, and notes that the reading is uncertain. It suggests "to make go through, to bore through, pierce, break (?)" as the meanings, and states that the word is a denominative from *pāra*. PTC notes the v.l. *pādemi* at Ja III 185,2*, and gives another reference[9] from Ja I 498,22*. It gives the meaning as "break (through)". It too makes a comparison with *pāra*.

The references are: *oramāma na pārema*, Ja I 498,22*, with the cty: *tucchaṃ pana naṃ kātuṃ na sakkoma* (498,25´); *vikkamāmi na pāremi* (v.l. *pādemi*), Ja III 185,2*, with the cty: *na pāremī ti pāraṃ pana chindituṃ na sakkomi* (185,4´). It is probably the inclusion of *chindituṃ* in the cty which has led to the idea that the word means "break, pierce".

Both sources are correct to see a connection with *pāra*, but *pāreti* is to be regarded as the equivalent of Skt *pārayati*, which is the causative of the

---

[6] EWA, Vol. I, p. 321, s.v. *gandhayate*.

[7] CDIAL 4016.

[8] Alsdorf, *op. cit.*, p. 25 n. 5.

[9] PTC III 268b.

root *pṝ* "to fill", rather than the denominative of *pāra*.[10] It therefore means "to fulfil, to make full, complete", i.e. "to be capable of completing, finishing something", "to do something successfully". The same meaning is found in Pkt, where Hemacandra (IV.86) teaches *pārei* as the equivalent of *śaknoti*. The same equivalence is given in Pāialacchī-nāmamālā (202), where, however, the editor Bühler was able to see that the word is not of *desī* origin, but is a development from Skt *pārayati*. PSM, doubtless misled by the fact that Hemacandra teaches it as a *desī* word, separates it from *pārei* < Skt *pārayati*, although giving the same references there as for the *desī* word *pārei*.

The meaning of the two references is therefore: (1) Let us give up; we are not successful", and (2) "I strive, (but) I am not successful".

The v.l. *pādemi* is doubtless an example of the not uncommon alternation of *r* and *d*.[11]

3. *marissa* "going to die"

PED lists this word with the form *marissaṃ*, but strangely states that this is a present participle = future. It occurs at Ja III 214,11*: *mataṃ marissaṃ rodanti ye rudanti lapanti ca*. It is glossed: *ye va loke matañ ca marissantañ ca rodanti*, 214,16´. It is included by Geiger in his section dealing with future participles in *-nt-* from the future stem (§ 193). Geiger gives a cross-reference to § 97.2, from which we can deduce that he is calling attention to the fact that this is a participle which has gone over to the *-a* declension by dropping *-nt-*, i.e. it is accusative and the equivalent of Skt *marisyantam*. Geiger refers to Pischel § 560, where *āgamissaṃ* is quoted from Āyāraṃga-sutta I.3.3.3 as being both nominative and accusative. This, then, is another example of a future participle with a short *-a* stem, i.e. in *-issa* rather than *-issanta*.

The other example Geiger gives in § 193 is *paccessaṃ*. PED does not list the form *paccessaṃ* s.v. *pacceti*. It occurs several times in a set of passages in Vin I 255,24–265,20, where a bhikkhu goes away after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, saying to himself: *paccessan ti,* or *idh' eva imaṃ cīvaraṃ kāressaṃ na paccessan ti*. The word is glossed: *na paccessan ti na*

---

[10] See MW, s.vv. *pārayati* and *pṝ*.
[11] See Brough, GDhp, p. 255 (ad GDhp 259).

puna āgamissaṃ (Sp 1112,15), i.e. it is a first person single future form, with the secondary ending *-aṃ* instead of the primary ending *-āmi*. This is not uncommon in Pāli.[12]

It is therefore surprising that Geiger lists *paccessaṃ* (§ 193) as an example of the future participle in *-nt* from the future stem. What is even more surprising is that he rejects Müller's suggestion that *karissaṃ* (Dāṭh III 80) is such a participle, on the grounds that it is clearly the first person single = *karisyāmi*. This would appear to be precisely the mistake which Geiger is making with *paccessaṃ*.

4. *vivicca-sayana* "a secluded lodging"

In his cty on the reading *vevita-śayaṇeṇa* at GDhp 65, Brough discussed the compound *vivicca-sayana* at Dhp 271. He stated[13]: "The reading *vivicca-* which has become current in the Pali text was doubtless adopted by Fausbøll as a lectio difficilior, but it really has little to commend it. It is apparently unknown to the manuscripts used for the edition of the Pali cty, which have the more natural reading *vivitta-*. The antiquity of the latter is guaranteed by the Pkt, and it therefore seems reasonable to reject *vivicca-*". PED does not list either *vivicca-sayana* or *vivitta-sayana*, nor does it refer to Dhp 271 under either *vivicca* or *vivitta*.

In their translation of the Dhammapada and the Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā, Carter and Palihawadana nevertheless read *vivicca* (although not as a compound with *sayanena*)[14], and note[15] that although PDhp 272 has *vivitta*, Udāna-v XXXII.31 has *vivikta*, GDhp has *vevita* and Dhp-a (PTS ed.)[16] has *vivitta*, the Dhammapada pūrāna sannaya (granthipada vivaraṇa sahita) does read *vivicca*.

It would seem, then, that there is rather more support for the reading than Brough thought, and there is no very compelling reason for opposing

---

[12] See Geiger § 150.
[13] Brough, GDhp, p. 191.
[14] They are, in general, opposed to Brough's suggestions, and it is possible that their acceptance of this reading is not unconnected with Brough's rejection of it.
[15] Carter and Palihawadana, *The Dhammapada*, p. 482 (n. 20).
[16] Dhp-a III 399,12.

Fausbøll's adoption of the reading. From Brough's reference to "the more natural reading *vivitta-*", I assume that he found it difficult to construe the absolutive *vivicca*. This need cause us no difficulty. It is, despite Carter and Palihawadana, to be taken as a compound with *sayana*, and the whole is to be regarded as a syntactical compound. Such compounds, composed of an absolutive and a noun, were discussed by Hendriksen.[17] He pointed out that they were to be interpreted as having developed from combinations of a verb-form and an absolutive belonging to it. He suggested that the syntax of a compound such as *viceyya-dāna* "giving with forethought" is derived from *viceyya dadāti* "he gives with forethought". The syntax of this phrase is taken over, giving the syntactical compound *viceyya-dāna*. In the case of *vicicca-sayana*, we may suppose that the underlying structure is *vivicca sayanaṃ kappeti* "going apart he makes his bed", from which *vivicca-sayana* was extracted.

5. *sosinna* "very wet"/*sosīna* "very cold"

PED suggests[18] these readings at Ja I 390,31* where Ee reads: *sotatto sosīto*, without v.l. The pāda is two syllables short, and Fausbøll suggests adding *ahaṃ* after *sotatto*. The pāda is glossed: *sotatto ti suriyasantāpena sutatto, sosīto ti himodakena susīto suṭṭhu tinto*, 391,1´–2´. Be reads *sotatto sosinno c' eva*, and glosses: *sūriyasantāpena suṭṭhu tatto, sosinno ti himodakena susinno suṭṭhu tinto*. The cty does not explain whether the difference is between day and night or summer and winter.

Although PED does not note it, the verse recurs at M I 79,29–30. There the pāda reads: *so tatto so sīno* (Ee Ce so; Se *sosino*; Be *sosinno c' eva*).[19] The gloss is more detailed than in Ja: *sotatto ti divā ātapena rattiṃ vana-usmāya sutatto. sosino* (Ee so; Be *sosinno*) *ti rattiṃ himena divā himodakena sutinto* (Be *suṭṭhu tinto*), Ps II 48,27. The difference is, therefore, between summer, when it is hot by both day and night, and winter, when the night is cold and the day is both wet and cold.

The inclusion of the word *tinto* in the gloss on both passages shows clearly that the commentators understood a word meaning "wet" rather than one meaning "cold". If this is so, then we can accept that the correct reading is *-sinno*. We may assume that *-sīna* replaced *-sinna* via a script where long vowels and double consonants were not written, producing **-sina*,[20] the scribal change being helped by the presence of *himena* and *hima-* in *himodakena* in the gloss. The alternation between *-sīto* and *-sīno* was probably helped by the similarity between *ta* and *na* in some forms of the Brāhmī script, including the Sinhalese variety, and the near identity of the meanings of the two words.

On the other hand, were it not for the gloss *-tinto*, we might well feel that there was an intended antithesis between being too hot by day and too cold at night because of frost. In that case, the correct reading might be *-sīno* "congealed, frozen" (< Skt *śīna*). We could then assume that the scribal tradition underlying Be had interpreted the received **-sino* in the light of *udaka* in the gloss *himodakena* "sleet (?)" and produced *-sinno*.

Cambridge   K.R. Norman

---

[17] H. Hendriksen, *Syntax of the infinite verb-forms of Pāli*, Copenhagen 1944, pp. 157–58.

[18] s.v. *sosīta*.

[19] The cadence - - - - in a prior śloka pāda is unusual, and we might rather think that the original form of the verse was *so sutatto so susinno*, with *so* and *su-* coalescing.

[20] Despite the identity of form, I believe that Se *sino* is an error, not a reminiscence of this ancient reading.